

**SACRAMENTO RIVER CONSERVATION AREA
BOARD OF DIRECTORS
MINUTES**

March 29, 2001
4:00 p.m.

Willows City Hall
Willows, Ca.

1. Chairman Denny Bungarz called the meeting of the Sacramento River Conservation Area to order at 4:05 p.m. at the above location. It was determined there was a quorum of (12) voting members present.

County	Public Interest	Landowner	Agency
Butte	Jane Dolan	Shirley Lewis	
Colusa	Doug White	Ben Carter	
Glenn	Denny Bungarz	(Jason Larrabee)	
Shasta	Glenn Hawes	(Dan Gover)	
Sutter	Dan Silva	Russell Young	
Tehama	Bill Borrer	Brendon Flynn	
Yolo	(Lynnel Pollock)	Marc Faye	
Resources Agency			Mel Dodgin
Cal DFG			Diana Jacobs
State Reclamation Board			(Pete Rabbon)
USF&WS		(Dan Castleberry)	Marie Sullivan
US COE			(Mark Charlton)
Cal DWR			(Dwight Russell)
Bureau of Reclamation			Laura Allen
Also present, an estimated audience of 30 interested persons			
Manager Burt Bundy			
Assistant Pat Brown, Recording Secretary			
Cal DWR			Stacy Cepello

2. Public Participation, Unscheduled Matters - Doug White thanked the Board and its forerunners for making this forum possible. He read from a statement concerning his commitment to his constituents to protect them and their property; that protection of the flood control system must come first. A landowner in the audience repeated his request for maps that show the ownership of land on each side of the river from Keswick to Verona; specifically, what agencies own what? He was advised this is in process but it is not easy to do. Sam Lawson from TNC noted they have their information available for Glenn, Butte and Tehama Counties and Alan Fulton, U.C. Coop. Ext., commented on the Colusa County land use study that he has just completed. Dan Keppen noted CALFED is working on the information also. Tom Evans, FWA, suggested it would also be valuable to know what lands *are going* to be acquired – it was noted, however, that private landowners don't necessarily want that. Will try to have a draft available at the next meeting. Calvert Cecil asked about a 2/28 letter representing several landowners that was sent to the SRCA from Mr. Timothy Kelleher. The letter requested that the enclosed Petition To Acknowledge Non-Participation be presented as an agenda item at the next Board meeting. Burt responded that the letter had been forwarded to legal counsel who had contacted Mr. Kelleher and was advised that he would not be available for the March 29 meeting so it was not placed on the agenda.
3. Consent Calendar – No items

4. Consider Adoption of Minutes of February 22, 2001 - Correction noted on Page 3, Item 6, 2nd paragraph should read Sam Lawson, *TNC*.... Dan Silva moved, seconded by Bill Borrer to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion passed by unanimous vote. It was noted that the January 18 minutes were approved without the minimum 3-landowners/3-public interest representations. Marc Faye moved, seconded by Doug White, to approve the January 18, 2001 minutes as previously presented. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

5. Consider the appointment of members of the Executive Committee – Chairman Bungarz asked for representatives to complete the Executive Committee. Brendon Flynn agreed to represent the landowner group, Glenn Hawes the public interest group, and Diana Jacobs the ex-officio group. Doug White moved, seconded by Bill Borrer, to accept the appointment of these members to the Executive Committee. Motion passed by unanimous vote.

6. Discussion and consider approval of a County Review Process – Chairman Bungarz opened the discussion on this issue and recognized Ben Carter who presented an amendment to the original draft language. The draft with amended language is as follows: “When both appointees of a county indicate opposition to a proposal within that county that has come before the SRCA Board for support, and the Board of Supervisors of that county has not declared a position on the proposal, the SRCA Board shall direct that the proponents request a public presentation before the County Board of Supervisors to determine that Board’s position on the proposal. ~~At a subsequent SRCA Board meeting, the Board shall consider the proposal and may take whatever position the Board deems appropriate.~~” If both appointees and the County Board of Supervisors oppose the proposal, the SRCA Board will not support the proposal. Comments followed: Some felt this would give the counties a sense of security; there was fear expressed of projects within the flood control system, they want to be sure that these projects will not impede flood control. There were concerns that because two votes can now rule, this might close off options to people, i.e., a landowner who wants to sell but cannot because an agency does not want to deal with that county; that veto itself is negative and would impact the balance of power. The point was made that the Board has no land use authority; each county makes land use decisions, which raised the question of what purpose this veto serves. A question was also asked about CALFED funding – whether a project would be funded if a county opposed it. Rebecca Fawver, CALFED, responded that they notify counties of projects they are looking at and they would not fund if there were opposition from the county. It was also noted that (1) This is a policy issue which can be changed or removed at another time and (2) Restoration projects are not the only projects, can also involve flood damage reduction and water supply. Marc Faye moved, seconded by Doug White to adopt the veto language as proposed by Ben Carter. Shirley Lewis requested there be a roll call vote. Burt Bundy polled the Board:

Bill Borrer – No	Denny Bungarz – Yes	Ben Carter – Yes	Mel Dodgin – No
Jane Dolan – Yes	Marc Faye – Yes	Brendon Flynn – Yes	Glenn Hawes – Yes
Shirley Lewis – Yes	Dan Silva – Yes	Doug White – Yes	Russell Young – Yes

 Motion passed by a vote of 10 –2.

7. Manager’s Report -
 - a. Overview of progress on sub-reach planning and site-specific planning projects. (See Attached)

 - b. Issues to be Resolved- In August, 2000, the Board assigned most of these issues either to the TAC, or to a special Board Committee. Also included are a few new issues that were not addressed by the committee and two issues that are in the Handbook and listed as “Issues to be

addressed later”. Burt discussed each issue individually with a brief recap of the status of each one:

- Issue #1 - Change Handbook amendment process – completed
- Issue #2 - County Review (Veto) – Board action due
- Issue #3 - “Good Neighbor Policy” – In Handbook
- Issue #4 - “Safe Harbor” – In Handbook, develop at TAC
- Issue #5 - Mitigation Fund – May require legislation
- Issue #6 - Grievance procedure – SRCA provides forum
- Issue #7 – PILT – MOA & Handbook support
- Issue #8 – IRZ Definition – TAC recommendation due soon
- Issue #9 – “Hard Point” definition – Board to set for adoption
- Issue #10 – Impact of rip-rap on habitat – TAC is discussing
- Issue #11 – Conservation Area definition – Wording to TAC
- Issue #12 – Economic Analysis – Report at next TAC
- Issue #13 – Public Access - Provide forum, discussion
- Issue #14 – Streamline permitting process – Continue to advocate

In summary, Burt noted that the Handbook Amendment Process, the County Review Process and the Hard Point Language Issues have been completed. Still developing are the IRZ definitions, impact of riprap, economic analysis, and the Conservation Area definition. The “Safe Harbor”, “Good Neighbor Policy”, streamlining the permit process, and PILT issues will be ongoing. To discuss for direction are the grievance procedure, public access, and mitigation fund issues. Marie Sullivan, F&WS, offered to speak at a Board and TAC meeting on “Safe Harbor” to help clarify what the term means. Francis Hickel, Colusa landowner, read from a statement he had prepared regarding some of the issues. He discussed mitigation funding and the need for there to be an avenue whereby they can mitigate with landowners. He also suggested another meeting be held in Reach 4 similar to the previous one to allow for more public input. Tom Evans, FWA, commented on the time that has passed since the issues were initially raised and asked that they be pursued even if legislative action is required. He also asked that no items be removed from the list. Chairman Bungarz noted that the Executive Committee would look at all of the above issues and decide which ones will be placed on a future agenda.

8. TAC REPORT – Dan Keppen, Chair of the TAC, discussed the March 22 TAC meeting . He noted a sub-committee has been formed to discuss the language in the Handbook concerning riprap and the impacts to riparian habitat. Dan suggested limiting the information portion at the TAC and possibly extending the length of the meetings. A question was raised concerning a draft biological opinion on the effect of riprap on endangered species on one site that involved several counties. Marie Sullivan stated she would review the draft and bring information to the next TAC meeting.
9. APPOINT A PUBLIC OUTREACH COMMITTEE – Chairman Bungarz asked for volunteers from the Board, and any other cooperators, to serve on this committee. Among its responsibilities will be understanding outreach needs, developing outreach strategy, and determining funding sources. It was determined that Laura Allen, U.S.B.R., will serve as Chair. The committee will be comprised of: Laura Allen, Denny Bungarz, Marlyce Myers, Marie Sullivan, Pat Brown, Jane Dolan, Burt Bundy, John Merz, and Anjanette Martin. Laura mentioned the Napa County Flood Control Project that uses tax money for both flood control and riparian restoration – may be useful information for a presentation.

10. ACTIVITIES UPDATE – Ramon Vega, F&WS, reported on an Environmental Assessment Document which is scheduled to go out for public review in approximately 6 weeks. They have set up several meetings on the Comprehensive Conservation Plan, a 15-year master plan for the refuge. He also noted that Packer Lake has now been open to the public since March 30. Sam Lawson, TNC, updated everyone on their acquisition and restoration program. He discussed the areas where they are purchasing, or negotiating to purchase, lands. The zone they are looking at is the land between the levees below Chico Landing and in the 2-1/2 year flood inundation zone from Chico Landing to Red Bluff. He noted this is a willing seller program; they do not initiate contact with the landowners. He discussed two properties totaling approximately 200 acres that TNC has owned for sometime south of Highway 32 that was purchased with borrowed funds. They have received a California Enhancement Grant for 88-1/2% of what was paid for the land. He gave the number of the Chico office (530) 897-6370 for anyone who would like additional information.
Bernard Flynn made available a handout on a restoration project implemented by Sacramento River Partners on approximately 26 acres within the 544-acre Mouth of Cottonwood Wildlife Area.
11. CORPS OF ENGINEERS COMPREHENSIVE STUDY TEAM PRESENTATION – Sue Fry discussed the current status of the Study. Sue pointed out that the Comprehensive Study is the only one that is looking at both flood damage reduction and ecosystem restoration. She noted Information Paper #1 (working DRAFT) has just been released and they want feedback. They are hoping to have the Final Report ready for Washington level review by 2003. Tom Evans stated his concerns about vegetation in the floodways and the problems that may arise from continuous riparian habitat. Dan Silva noted that counties involved in flood control and flood protection need to think about the Comprehensive Study and the impact it will have on land use and planning decisions; as the largest flood control study ever conducted it will have an impact on the socio-economic base of the counties.
12. NEXT MEETING – The next SRCA Board meeting will be held on April 26th at the Willows City Hall, Willows, at 4:00 p.m.
The following month will be held on May 24th at the Willows City Hall, Willows, at 4:00 p.m.
13. Meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.